



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

LEHRBUCH DER NEUTESTAMENTLICHEN THEOLOGIE. Von *Heinrich Julius Holtzmann*, Dr. und Ord. Professor der Theologie in Strassburg. Freiburg, i. B. and Leipsic: J. C. B. Mohr. 1896. Lieferungen 1-4. Price, M. 1.50 per Lieferung.

New Testament theology has only recently been developed into a science. Formerly the dogmatic interest of the various denominations was too strong, and the New Testament was used simply for the purpose of procuring evidence of the truth of their particular doctrines. The name of Biblical theology as an independent discipline was used first in 1708 by Haymann, but it was not till 1787 that Gabler spoke of it as an independent science. His colleagues Lorenz and Bauer made a distinction between Old and New Testament theology from 1800 on, and they also suggested to Pölitz, Cludius, and Schwartz the idea of a scientific reconstruction of original Christianity. The more dogmatic interests disappeared, the more historicocritical investigations gained the upper hand. In connexion with this independent development of New Testament theology, grew up also the New Testament exegesis which from the direct bearing of a historically correct conception of original Christianity upon the present doctrines of the church proved to be of all-absorbing interest. Here must be mentioned such great historians as Neander with his compendious knowledge of all ecclesiastical literature. He was followed by Reuss, the first theologian who viewed the New Testament under the aspect of an evolutionary process, claiming that there was first Jewish Christianity, then Paulinism and other attempts at reconciling Hellenism and Judaism, and lastly the theology of St. John. Upon this foundation the school of Tübingen represented by Schwegler and Baur took its stand. The latter places the doctrine of Jesus and of the Apostles at the beginning, and contrasts in the first period of the development of the church the doctrines of Paul and Saint John of the Revelation, which are followed by conciliatory attempts represented in Mark, Luke, and the Paul's Epistles to the Hebrews, Ephesians, Colossians and others. The latter are a transition to the formation of the dogmas of the Catholic Church, best represented in the pastoral letters and in St. John. Hilgenfeld sides with Baur, while a reaction against the Tübingen School is represented in the names of Ewald and Ritschl. In more

modern days we have the works of Weizsäcker, Hausrath, Oosterzee, Köstlin, Weiss, Beyschlag, and especially Pfleiderer.

Holtzmann is one of the most prominent investigators and interpreters of the New Testament, and there is no one better informed in this line of work than he is. His *Lehrbuch* and his *Handcommentar* to the New Testament are the best that can be had, and are recognised as such. The author is the man to give us also a *Lehrbuch* of New Testament theology.

Professor Holtzmann's present work, which has now reached four instalments and will be perfected in twelve, is, like all his other books, a concise and impartial summary of the present state of investigation. He condenses the work of his predecessors and presents rather the general advance made by them as a whole than an investigation of his own.

The four instalments before us contain two parts: first, Jesus and the Evangelists; and secondly, Paul and the Post-Apostolic literature. Neither is complete in the copy before us, the former breaking off abruptly at page 144, the second at page 240.

After a review of the literature of New Testament theology and a sketch of its development as an independent discipline, Holtzmann characterises the period of Nomism in the history of the later Judaism. He describes, according to the various views advanced, the contrast between Phariseeism and Sadduceeism, the modes of Jewish tradition, the method of interpreting the law, the development of the Apocalyptic literature, which is a product of the disappointments and sufferings of the Jews who fulfilled the law punctiliously while God did not seem to make good his promises. But the end was not yet; God can be relied upon. Therefore they hoped for a Messiah who would take a terrible revenge on the heathens, restore Israel to its political independence, or even make it the ruler of all nations. Thus the Messianic idea assumed definite shape and led to various conceptions of the nature of the Saviour who, however, was always regarded as a political restorer of Israel. Some thought that he would be a scion of David's house, while others, especially the priestly aristocracy, expected him of the tribe of Levi. The former gained the upper hand, but such were the views common among the people, that a sister-in-law of Herod the Great could think of finding the Messiah either in her husband or in one of her sons. Moral qualities of the Messiah and superhuman features were not expected of him. The people pictured him in their minds rather like Judas-Maccabee than like any one of the Prophets.

Since Alexander the Great the Jews had spread among the nations of the Roman Empire without surrendering their religion and Jewish customs. They became mediators of the monotheistic idea and helped to prepare the world for the acceptance of Christianity. The translation of the Old Testament into Greek, commonly called the Septuagint, was a condition of the *pleroma*, the fulfilment of the times. Without the Greek Bible we might have had the provincial literature of an Aramaic religion, but no New Testament theology. All Greek sages became greatly inter-

ested in Judaism on account of its stern monotheism, and many joined the Jewish faith, without, however, accepting either circumcision or the Mosaic law. They remained mere guests in the synagogues of Israel and a few only became proselytes.

While thus the Greeks were prepared for receiving a religious revelation that would come from the Jews, the Jews of the *diaspora* themselves became acquainted with Greek philosophy. And they were astonished at the purity and precision of Aristotle and the grandeur of Plato. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul so plainly set forth in the *Phædo* made a deep impression on them, and the result was a peculiar literature in which Greek and Jewish thought were blended, leading on the one hand to such *Apocrypha* as the Book of Wisdom and on the other hand to the philosophical conceptions of Philo, who developed the idea of the divine Logos.

By the side of the conservative Pharisees and the Hellenising Sadducees, a sect arose, apparently of foreign growth, the members of which called themselves Essenes. Their ascetic tendencies are un-Jewish; their reverence for the light and the sun point to Parseeism; their condemnation of the oath and of slavery reminds one of Neo-Pythagorism, and yet they are older than the Neo-Pythagorean school, for we have evidences of their existence in the second century before Christ. Thus they may be regarded as an independent but parallel development of the tendencies which prevailed in the whole Roman Empire and produced such philosophies as Neo-Pythagorism and Platonism. The underlying theory in both Alexandrianism and Essenism appears to be an endeavor to get rid of all that is sensual and to come into close contact with God who is conceived as pure spirit.

The main problem of the New Testament theology is apparently the personality of Jesus himself. Holtzmann does not believe that the character of Jesus can be explained as a myth. The mysterious power which Jesus manifests is so original, so peculiar, so individual that it could not be the product of speculative thought. We are confronted here with a reality, and everything we read in the synoptic Gospels about Jesus tends to corroborate the genuineness of the picture. The religion of Jesus is not the product of school doctrines. He who would try to explain his appearance as a combination of the conflicting theologies of his time will miss the most characteristic feature of his life. Jesus apparently nourished his soul at a well of living waters and did not draw his inspirations from books. Thus nature is mirrored in crystal-clear reflexion in his speeches. His imagination does not suffer from Oriental exaggeration. His mind is not distorted by Rabbinical wit or subtleties, and there can be no question about it that he is the child of Galilee, of the country which is described as a continuous garden where palms and figs and flowers grow. If he had grown up in a city like Jerusalem he would not have introduced similes and invented parables of provincial life as he did. His native country is the background of all his speeches and only a Galilean could expect to find figs at Easter-time in Jerusalem. There is nothing gloomy in his views of nature. He speaks of God's sun and its radiance, of the birds under the sky, and the flowers in the fields,

of the rain that pours down on the just and the unjust. Any one who uses such language is in no danger of the theologian stifling the man.

The life of nature apparently made a deep impression upon Jesus, but he concentrated his attention even more upon the life of man ; and here again we find the social conditions of Galilee, not the city-life of Jerusalem, nor views which might be uttered in the schoolroom. Jesus was familiar with the joys and sufferings of the country and the people, and thus he was enabled to voice the deepest religious sentiments. God was to him like the house-father, and there are many pictures of family-life in his parables. He speaks of the children sitting round the table with their parents, the dogs waiting for the crumbs that are thrown down to them, and when it is dark, of the light that is put on a candlestick, which gives light to all that are in the house. Neighbors and friends are mentioned who are invited on festive occasions (Luke xv., 69). The children sleep in the chamber together with their father (Luke xi., 7) ; and he does not tire of speaking of children as being nearest and dearest to his heart.

By the side of these friendly pictures of family life Jesus also mentions the oppressive social conditions of the laborers, servants, or slaves, and of the hired workman in the vineyards. He frequently mentions the good man of the house who is the head slave, the overseer of the other servants, either proving himself to be reliable or being a tyrant oppressing his companions. The slave girls are alluded to who work the hand-mill and who must sleep two in a bed. All of them are subject to the cruel laws of the times and depend upon the will of their master. When they have tired themselves in the fields they are still kept busy in the house (Luke xvii., 7-9). They serve at table, and it is a distinction if they are entrusted by their master with money affairs. Jesus repeatedly introduces the master of the house in his attitude of going over their accounts and computing the returns of the entrusted money. When the master travels the servants wait for his return, and remain awake during the night.

But the hardships of slavery which are introduced without further reflexion in the sermons of Jesus, are not the worst features of the social conditions of those days. The greatest misery is represented in the cripples and the beggars on the streets, the tramps on the highroads, the thieves in the cities, the robbers in the woods, the malefactors who carry their own cross, imprisoned debtors, etc. We learn of the transactions of usury, bills of indebtedness, the severity of creditors, the contentions between parties on the way to the judge, punishments by the court, etc., etc.

Yet while Jesus describes scenes from life such as he must have witnessed in his childhood and early youth, he was at the same time not unfamiliar with the Scriptures. His speeches show a special familiarity with Deutero-Isaiah and also several of the Apocryphal and Apocalyptic writings. In Luke xi., 49, he quotes from a Book of Wisdom which is no longer extant, and there are passages in Matthew and Luke which contain echoes of Jesus Sirach.

Jesus must have learned reading and writing, for we are informed that he read chapters from the Prophets in the synagogue and addressed the Pharisees repeatedly with the words: "Have you not read?" He quotes from the history of his people and is full of Biblical reminiscences. It is true that he makes mistakes in his exegesis, but he proves himself a genuine prophet by the freedom with which he introduces his interpretations. The Scriptures are to him only incidental and accessory corroborations of the religious experiences which he had had himself, and thus he shows an assurance and superiority, which, although he never places himself above the Scriptures, makes it possible that he speaks with authority. The Scriptures are to him like a glass in which he sees his own face and behind it the face of God.

The influence of Essenism on Jesus has been a matter of dispute. His condemnation of the oath, his celibacy, and the communism involved in the idea of the surrender of property, the redundancy of temple service and bloody sacrifices indicate some connexion between Jesus and Essenism; but Holtzmann is inclined to regard these coincidences as being due to the moral ideals of the times, for Jesus was very different from the Essenes, as he did not place his light under a bushel as they did in their retirement. They represented a separatistic sect while he lived in the world and communicated with all the people, scribes and Pharisees, publicans and sinners.

The Pharisees were apparently that party with whom Jesus in the beginning of his career was most closely connected. He appears as a guest in the synagogues. He knows their methods of teaching, he uses their modes of argument and proves his case on the authority of Scriptures, in exactly the same style which they were wont to use. He discusses problems such as that proposed to Hillel, Which is the first and the greatest commandment? (Mark xii., 28; Matth. xxii., 36.) He introduces the term "righteousness" as frequently as did the Pharisees, only that he deepened the meaning of the word: It is still the dominant theme in the Sermon on the Mount. Where he combats the Pharisees, he does so with their own weapons. He discusses the worth of almsgiving and the reward in heaven. He agrees with the Pharisees on the doctrine of resurrection against the Sadducees, and it is not mere chance that Paul the great apostle who completed the mission of Jesus came also from the school of the Pharisees.

But the main difference between Jesus and the Pharisees is his more natural and more human conception of the righteousness of the law. In his explanation of the law, his own genius asserts itself. Imbued with the experiences of real life he applies his religious views to the conditions that surround him, and is free from all scholasticism and scholarly prejudices. He is not a professional scribe but a self-taught man who bears the prototype of his religious ideals in himself, and this gives him a self-reliance which cannot be acquired by book-learning. His belief in God is not born in the storms of despair, but it appears like sunshine upon the quiet sea of Galilee.

Considering the character of Jesus, such as is here described, it is natural that he possesses no special method of teaching. He does not use the abstract definitions of the schools. He shows no doctrinal reflexion, nor any dogmatic system. He is a man of the people and not, as St. Paul and St. John, a theologian. He never cares to solve problems of science. He even neglects the order and consistency of his thoughts. He is always bent on solving practical questions which he does by his faith in a world of divine truth. He never aspires for lucidity, but always for a popularly impressive expression of his thoughts which are communicated as directly as possible. We must understand every single word from the motives which prompt it, and in order to judge of his personality we ought first to be able to translate his speeches back into Aramaic, for they have suffered greatly by being transcribed into a Greek garment. This is a work which has only recently been begun by Arnold Meyer.

The originality of Jesus appears mainly in his application of religion to practical life. As the roots of his view of nature and of man are taken directly from life, so he applies them directly to the needs which he sees about them. He is more a child of nature than the theologians of later centuries would have it.

While Jesus has a deep reverence for the sacred traditions of his nation, and while he is willing to fulfil the law, he sees no need of obeying all the various injunctions which the Pharisees and scribes prescribe. The law as it was understood in Jesus' time was a heavy burden upon the people. It presupposed a study, for who could know all the rules about prayer, about washings, about the tithes, sacrifices, and ceremonials? The law of the Jews had become a religion for the rich. It was utterly impracticable for poor people. The parents of Jesus themselves were unable to comply with all the demands of the law, for we know that only once they travelled to Jerusalem, a journey which, according to the law, had to be made three times a year by a good Jew. We have the express statement that Jesus himself did not observe the fasts and that he did not hesitate to break the Sabbath. The mass of the people lived in utter ignorance of the details of the law, and considering the burden of the law, we can now appreciate that Jesus praises the unlearned and uneducated by saying "Blessed are the poor in spirit." He comes with a Gospel for the poor. He addresses not the pious Jews only, but the sinners, those who by the pressure of circumstances no longer continued to observe the law and formed a class by themselves upon whom the orthodox Pharisee looked down with contempt. The parents of Jesus themselves probably sat down to dinner without washing their hands according to the Levitic injunctions, and it was a matter of course to him that they did not thereby defile themselves. It must sometimes have been difficult for a carpenter when at work to obey the circumstantial commands of eating his meal in the orthodox fashion. Jesus knew that the law could mean purity of heart and not of hands, and he understood that not the food that enters the mouth but the words that come out of the mouth can defile the character of a man.

It is the directness of his experiences which conditions his superiority and the breadth of his mind shown in his communion with the pious Jews as well as with the publicans and sinners; and this is not the product of study, and of consideration, but natural instinct, which becomes more and more a conscious opposition to the narrowness of Phariseeism. Thus the gist of his doctrine is contained in the words, 'The poor have the Gospel preached to them,' and St. Luke says: 'The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.' But his salvation does not consist in urging the severity of Phariseeism, but in preaching the Kingdom of Heaven, which since those who are invited do not come, will be inherited by the crippled, the lame, and the beggars from the street.

So much for the first part, and the most important problem of New Testament theology. We hope to recur to Professor Holtzmann's work as soon as the remainder is published.

P. C.

DIE PROPHETISCHE OFFENBARUNG NACH WESEN, INHALT UND GRENZEN. Unter dem Gesichtspunkte der alttestamentlichen Weissagung geschichtlich und psychologisch untersucht von Dr. Paul Schwartzkopff, Professor in Wernigerode. Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Buchhandlung. 1896. Pages, 169.

A new theology is being built up, not in the quarters of the old rationalism, which in Germany are gathered in the *Protestantenverein*, but in those circles where the orthodox traditions prevail; and among modern theologians Paul Schwartzkopff has offered to the world in these latter days most valuable contributions which are distinguished by philosophical method and critical ability. Men like Kuennen, Wellhausen, Cornill, Harnack, Holtzmann are historical scholars of first degree; Schwartzkopff's specialty lies in another field; he is sufficiently versed in the works of these great pathfinders to be perfectly at home in Biblical theology, but he concentrates his investigations upon the fundamental questions which are to be decided as a matter of principle rather than as a historical fact. For this purpose he wrote his treatise on the fallibility of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Here the historical problems are brought under a philosophical aspect, in which, in the spirit of the present age, psychological considerations are most prominent. The present treatise on "Prophetic Revelation" is quite similar in kind and forms an important part of the whole system, promising to be very acceptable to theologians as the best solution of the various difficulties into which the traditional interpretation of religion, through the rapid progress of all the sciences, has been drifting.

Schwartzkopff approaches the problems of exegesis, text-criticism, and interpretation not by expounding the sundry individual passages, but by selecting salient instances and developing the characteristic features of all of them. In the book before us, he undertakes to determine the nature of the prophetic revelation in both

---

<sup>1</sup> *Konnte Jesus irren?* Unter dem geschichtlichen, dogmatischen und psychologischen Gesichtspunkte principiell beantwortet. Reviewed in *The Monist*, Vol. VI., No. 3.